![Madrone environmental services ltd. logo]

**2000-2004 PROJECT STATUS REPORT (YEAR 4)**

**CARIBOU POPULATIONS AND ECOLOGY, NORTHERN MUSKWA-KECHIKA**

**(Project# MK2003-2004 36B)**



*Prepared for:*

**Muskwa-Kechika Trust Fund**
150 – 10003 – 110th Avenue
Fort St. John, B.C.  V1J 6M7

**Prepared by:**

**Gillian Radcliffe,** *R.P.Bio.* **& Tania Tripp,** *R.P.Bio.*

**MADRONE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES LTD.**

**1081 Canada Avenue, Duncan, BC   V9L 1V2**

**March 2004**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

MADRONE
environmental services ltd.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Muskwa-Kechika Management Area (MKMA) supports one of the largest intact predator-prey ecosystems based on large mammal populations in North America. In order to support future wildlife management and conservation objectives for these predator-prey systems, this project aims to establish baseline ecological information on one of the main caribou herds in the northern Muskwa – Kechika (MK), the Muskwa Herd, for which little was known at project inception. The research objective is to increase knowledge of population parameters, caribou/habitat associations through habitat mapping, and analysis of caribou seasonal habitat use.

It is hoped that the scientific results of this study will be utilized to develop management tools for pre-tenure planning, to predict impacts not only of industrial developments, but also of increased human recreational activities, and to support decisions on wildlife management, and resource developments. This study will also provide baseline data for future population monitoring, and long-term sustainability of this wildlife resource.

### Results Overview - October 2000 to February 2004

- Of the 46 animals collared between 2000 and 2003, 12 collared animals were recently relocated as of February, 2004. A total of 17 collars are now considered active; two collars have dropped off; three collars have failed (*i.e.,* originally presumed missing but subsequently observed during fieldwork); and the remainder are considered missing in action (no signal received for at least 6 months).

- In November of 2003, five additional female caribou were collared in order to maintain the number of functioning collars in the study area.

- Of the 11 known mortalities that have occurred over the period of this study, two occurred during the first fiscal year (October, 2000 to March, 2001), another two in the second fiscal year (April, 2001 to March, 2002), seven in this third fiscal year (April, 2002 to March, 2003), and none in the fourth (April, 2003 to March, 2004).

- A total of 878 VHF telemetry re-location points have been collected from aerial telemetry flights while monitoring the collared animals since the start of the project in October, 2000. The number of location points per animal range from 2 with the newly collared animals, up to 42 for two of the animals collared in 2000.

- Of the three Argos satellite collars fitted in October 2001, one ceased to transmit in December, 2001. The other two collars ceased transmitting satellite data as of December, 2002 and April, 2003 respectively. VHF remains operational on all three VHF/ARGOS collars for continued monitoring.

- A total of 1508 satellite re-location points (location class 3, 2, or 1) were received during the monitoring (over 18 months) with the Argos collars (October 22, 2001 to April 8, 2003). Collar ID 39M39 (Argos ID 20766 quit April 8, 2003) received 336 re-location

MADRONE
environmental services ltd.

points. Collar ID 40M40 (Argos ID 14200 quit December 10, 2001) received 48 re-location points. Collar ID 41M41 (Argos ID 26338 quit December 8, 2002) received 1124 re-location points.

- In addition to fixed wing telemetry flights, two helicopter based surveys were conducted in order to characterize important life stages of the species. These were a spring cow/calf census in June, and a fall rut count (October).

- The late winter (March) survey was not conducted in 2004 due to lack of funding, however, a fixed wing flight took place in late February, 2004.

- On average the number of animals counted per fall rut census (n = 4) was 469 animals (range of 288-658); for the late winter (n = 6) it was 288 (range of 191-455); and for the spring cow/calf census (n = 3) it was 462 (range of 401-520). The amount of effort spent during each census varied depending on weather conditions and animal numbers.

- A substantial effort was made to complete a caribou habitat map base this year. The vegetation habitat plot database, and information from other vegetation and mapping projects in the area, were used in developing a broad unit vegetation (caribou habitat) map for the entire study area (890,424 hectares).

- Previous projects (three PEM projects, one TEM project) were correlated with project-specific Caribou Habitat Units. A large area (280,368 hectares) previously unmapped was then mapped using the existing biogeoclimatic mapping, topographic mapping, and satellite imagery. A digital elevation model was applied to model aspect for this newly mapped area.

- Several iterations of the habitat mapping were run, with internal quality control applied through plot review and examination of orthophotos of the study area. Ultimately, a surprisingly seamless Caribou Habitat Map was developed for the entire area, to support future habitat use analyses and model development.

MADRONE
environmental services ltd.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MADRONE
environmental services ltd.

MADRONE
environmental services ltd.

**List of Tables**

**List of Figures**

MADRONE
environmental services ltd.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Despite the national and international significance of the large mammal predator-prey systems of the Muskwa-Kechika Management Area (MKMA), studies have not previously been conducted upon caribou ecology in the northern half of the area until recently. Population estimates indicate this area supports a very substantial proportion (approximately 13%) of BC's northern caribou population (Radcliffe, 2000).

Although studies have been conducted elsewhere in the province, often in response to timber resource development, in this study area very different ecological conditions and resource demands prevail. Future years can be expected to bring a variety of significant issues with regard to the management of caribou herds, and the predator-prey systems in general. Oil and gas development, management for meeting BC Parks objectives, future guide-outfitting demands, and timber development, are likely to result in conflicting objectives and often highly contentious issues. There will be a need to develop an area specific management plan tailored to the ecological conditions, predator-prey systems, and human resource demands that operate in this area. A solid scientific foundation is needed for making appropriate management decisions that will ensure the major predator-prey systems in this area remain relatively intact.

This project aims to establish baseline ecological information on one of the two main caribou herds in the MK, the Muskwa herd, to support future wildlife management and conservation objectives for the predator-prey systems in the northern part of the MK. The work involves the detailed characterization of the Muskwa herd, including population sizes, sex ratios, recruitment, mortality, home ranges, especially winter ranges and calving areas, seasonal movements and habitat use.

A dynamic management strategy aimed at evaluating and managing the cumulative effects of multiple resource use within the home ranges of the main caribou herds is the eventual project goal. Project objectives are thus fully consistent with the purposes of the MKTF.

This report presents the data collected from project initiation in 2000 up to data collected in March of 2004, which covers three of a planned four-year field project on the population and ecology of the Muskwa caribou herd in the northern MKMA.

### 1.1. Research Objectives

Overall goals are to:

1. Establish baseline ecological information on the main caribou herd, primarily the Muskwa herd, in the northern Muskwa – Kechika, to support future wildlife management and conservation objectives, and future population monitoring.

2. Develop a caribou management strategy geared to the ecological and resource use activities that prevail in the northern MK.

These will be achieved through meeting the following subsidiary objectives:

- Identify the population parameters, including overall numbers, sex ratios, recruitment, and mortality, (including predation rates) for the Muskwa caribou herd;

- Identify the seasonal ranges of the herd, especially winter ranges and calving areas; identify seasonal movements, travel corridors;

- Document habitat use patterns and improve knowledge of seasonal habitat needs in the north, including security habitat for predator avoidance;

- Develop/fine tune existing caribou habitat models to predict caribou distributions across the landscape;

- Develop the model into a management tool that will permit the evaluation of proposed development impacts, including cumulative effects assessment, and that will provide a solid foundation for making decisions regarding caribou management in the area; and

- Communicate project results to members of the public as well as to fellow researchers in both the public and private sectors.

## 1.2. Applicable MKMA Objectives

- To support wildlife and wilderness resources of the management area through research and integrated management of natural resource development; and

- To maintain in perpetuity the diversity and abundance of wildlife species and the ecosystems on which they depend throughout the Management Area.

## 1.3. Project Objectives - 2003 to 2004

Activities conducted in 2003 continued to build on the previous years of data. The following specific activities were originally proposed for the 2003-2004 fiscal:

- Conduct a spring census for cow/calf ratios, and identify calving areas (June 2003 - third year of spring calving data);

- Conduct a fall rut population census of the herd (Oct 2003 - fourth year of rut census);

- Collar at least 5 animals in October to replace damaged/lost or malfunctioning collars;

- Conduct a late winter census (fourth year of late winter data);

- Continue regular telemetry work through all seasons (identify seasonal habitats and movements via fixed wing and helicopter flights);

- Develop and refine the habitat map base (broad ecosystem units). Final QA was proposed for June 2004, with any necessary final tweaking planned for the fall/early winter of 2004. As the end map product is the foundation for interactive public-oriented information products, high quality of the habitat data and mapping is essential;

- Enter and analyse data (all phases);

- Develop draft products including habitat mapping, and summary interpretive maps

- Begin preliminary analysis of data and home range estimates; and

- Complete data summaries and year end data report.

The 2003-2004 period was in effect the third complete year of data collection. However, due to limited funding it had a reduced field program (*e.g.,* no late winter census, and fewer telemetry re-location flights), and reduced analysis time. A substantial portion of the available funds was applied to complete the Caribou Habitat Mapping (see section 4.6).

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

This project was initiated in 1999 with seed funding from the MKTF to produce a background review. The initial year of a proposed four-year field research project was funded by the MKTF and Slocan in 2000 and 2001. The background review by Radcliffe (2000) provides a detailed synopsis of information relevant to caribou population and ecological research in the Muskwa-Kechika, completed as Phase 1 of this project. Phase 2 consists of the applied 4-year field program, which began in October of 2000.

### 2.1. Study Area Location

The project is based out of Toad River (logistically the most feasible center of operations), in management units on either side of the Alaska Highway (see Figure 1). Heard and Vagt (1998) reported that the Muskwa herd ranges within the Mt. Dall, Crest, Toad, and Racing River areas. The study area thus climbs from the lowlands of the Snake and Dunedin Rivers, up through the Dunedin foothills, into Stone Mountain. It then extends west across Toad River to the eastern portion of Muncho Lake Park, south around Racing River, across Wokkpash to the Chischa River system, then north and east towards Tetsa River Park.

The study area incorporates diverse topography and a wide range of habitat types. It ranges from the rugged peaks of Stone Mountain Park, through expansive rolling foothill country, to the relatively subdued terrain that prevails to the north and east, in the Liard Plain. Several wide river valleys support a range of riparian habitats. The biogeoclimatic zones that occur are the Boreal White and Black Spruce (BWBS) at the lower elevations, the Spruce - Willow Birch (SWB), and some areas of Alpine Tundra (AT). Substantial large mammal numbers exist within the study area, with healthy populations of Stone's sheep, mountain goat, Rocky Mountain elk, moose, and caribou, black and grizzly bears, and wolves.

Portions of the study area are located within three of the Muskwa-Kechika Resource Management Zones (RMZs): Eight Mile/Sulphur, Stone Mountain, and Churchill. A number of protected areas also fall within the study boundaries, including:

- ❖ Muncho Lake Provincial Park (eastern portion)

- ❖ Stone Mountain Provincial Park

- ❖ Wokkpash Provincial Recreation Area

- ❖ Northern Rocky Mountains Protected Area (Testa and Chischa River Areas)

Study area boundaries were refined after the first year of data collection, as the extent of the caribou ranges became more clearly identified. Subsequent data collection since the first year has not resulted in any further changes.



**Figure 1: Caribou study area within the MKMA.**

## 3.0  METHODOLOGIES

Background preparatory work was conducted during the summer of 2000, but the main thrust of the work began in the fall of 2000, with the onset of the field program.  Caribou capture and collaring occurred following the fall rut in late October 2000, and again in 2001.  Regular data collection began after initial collaring was completed.

### 3.1. Capture and Collaring

Individual adult female caribou from the Muskwa herd were captured and collared with VHF radio transmitters for re-locating and tracking their movements.  One of the original research data collection goals was to maintain 20-25 collared animals over the duration of the project if possible, and to assess the value of installing a subset of ARGOS units during the second year of the study.

#### 3.1.1.  Animal Care

As we were concerned about stress to the caribou from handling, we met with Helen Schwantje (provincial MWLP vet) and Ian Hatter (MWLP ungulate specialist) in Victoria to discuss this issue prior to capturing any animals. We reviewed general methods and standards, and left with an increased level of comfort in our study design and approach.

As outlined in approved permits from BC Parks and MWLP, Fort Nelson, obtained prior to capture, all animals were released in a timely fashion.  No animals were held in captivity, and no immobilization drugs were used.  The caribou were caught individually using a net shot from a helicopter over appropriate habitat (open, flat ground with minimal shrubs and snow to cushion the fall).  Animals were processed as quickly as possible, and all efforts were made to minimize stress.

#### 3.1.2.  Biological Samples and Data Collection

Helen Schwantje and Bryan Webster (BC Parks, Fort Nelson) requested that we collect body measurements, as well as hair, blood and fecal specimens for Provincial studies.  Helen provided details and the necessary equipment for sample collection and storage.

Data collected for each captured animal typically included:  observation date, species code, session label, observation #, surveyors, general location, UTM (using a hand held GPS unit), sex, age class, reproductive condition (lactating, post lactating or estrus), evidence of nursing, # of young, age of young, serial #, radio frequency, tooth wear (minimal, moderate or heavy), pelage colour and condition, scarring, and body condition (rump, shoulders, and withers) (Appendix 1). When possible measurements were collected as per Shackleton (1999).

#### 3.1.3.  Capture and Collaring 2003

Capture and collaring of the project animals was described in detail in earlier data reports (Madrone 2001 and 2002).  An additional five animals were planned to be collared in October 2003 (immediately after the rut count) in an effort to maintain at least 20 active collars. Replacement of collared animals that had malfunctioning signals (*i.e.,* weak signals, no

signals, or false mortality signal) was intended as the priority over collaring new animals. However, lack of snow in October and limited budgets constrained capture opportunities, and instead five new females were collared in November. All crew members involved in the capture and handling of the caribou were fully qualified to complete the tasks assigned to them. Qualified, experienced net gunners and helicopter pilots were hired (Grant Lordie was the net-gunner in 2000, and Brad Culling in 2001 and 2003) (Helicopter pilots were Zvonko Dancevic and Cam Allen - QWEST Helicopters, Fort Nelson).

### 3.1.4. Radio Frequencies and Collars

The approved VHF frequencies for the collars were researched by Mary Duda who received approval for use of 148.00 to 149.99 mhz. In theory there should be no overlaps with other animals in the study area or adjacent areas.

A Victoria based company, Human Animal Biotelemetry Instrumentation Technology (H.A.B.I.T.), produced the VHF and Argos collars for this study. A total of 46 low profile rubber-belted VHF collars, three of which had the additional Argos satellite capability, were purchased. Specifications included collars adjustable in 1" increments to fit neck circumference between 16 to 32"; 60 Pulse per minute; signal strength of 25-30 milli Watts; duty cycle to save battery life (off from 10PM-4AM, 6 hours shut down); mortality sensors on all collars with a faster pulse in order to detect using the scanner function on the receiver, otherwise it might be missed (120 pulses per minute for ease of distinguishing from live pulse); mortality was signaled by no movement for 6 hours; a battery life of at least three years was specified.

## 3.2. Field Data Collection

The project involves the detailed characterization of the herd, including population size, sex ratio, recruitment, mortality, home ranges, especially winter ranges and calving areas, and seasonal movements and travel corridors. To accomplish this, a total of 46 female caribou in the study area were captured and collared with VHF radio transmitters, for re-locating and tracking their movements (30 caribou collared in 2000, 11 in 2001, and 5 in 2003). Three of the collars also had additional Argos satellite capability. The data collected from relocating these collared animals, combined with the recently completed habitat mapping, also permits us to examine the seasonal habitat uses of the herd.

Geographic locations were collected in three main ways.

1. Aerial fixed wing telemetry surveys were conducted as regularly as the weather and budgets would permit from October 2000 to March 2004. This data provides information on year round and seasonal home ranges, and some information on elevational use and broad habitat use.

2. Seasonal helicopter surveys were conducted in late winter, spring (June) and in the fall, primarily to collect more detailed population data, however all caribou observations are given a fixed geographic location that can then be plotted on a map, providing additional data for

assessing ranges and habitat use. Each point on the map may represent an individual or a group of caribou observed.

3. Satellite transmitters were fitted on three of the radio collared individuals and location information for these animals was received via e-mail on a daily basis. Quality of the information varies however, and in order to accurately track the movements of the caribou only the better location classes (3, 2 or 1) were accepted as re-location points and used to plot distribution maps.

These methods are described in more detail below. All geographic data is stored in project databases.

## 3.3. Telemetry Re-location Surveys

Re-location surveys by air were attempted on a monthly basis when weather and funding permitted. Weather in the study area is often inclement, however, resulting in what can be prolonged periods without data collection. Ground based telemetry was conducted opportunistically but was generally of very limited benefit, so we placed little emphasis on this approach.  Animals continued to be located from the air approximately monthly.

As in prior years, a combination of fixed wing (mainly 185 model) and helicopter were used to conduct the re-locations.  The LoTech Receivers (STR 1000 and SRX400 - frequency range is 142-152) were used to relocate the animals.  Jim Hart was the pilot for all fixed wing telemetry flights.  During these solo flights Jim flew the plane, and collected the re-location data. On helicopter re-location flights Gillian Radcliffe, and either Tania Tripp, Peter Smilie, or Nancy-Anne Rose collected the re-location data. Cam Allen of QWEST was usually the pilot.

Re-locations were collected in decimal degrees or UTM depending on technology available (*e.g.,* handheld units vs. helicopter and fixed-wing units).  Additional information collected whenever possible included: visual confirmation of collared animals, number in the group, sex of other animals in the group, general location and habitat description, and in some cases behavioural notes (*i.e.,* feeding, bedding, traveling, birthing, etc.).  Generally this level of detail was only possible to collect during helicopter surveys.

## 3.4. Argos Satellite Re-locations

Three Argos satellite transmitters were added to VHF collars in October 2001. An Argos account was maintained and satellite re-location points were received daily as latitude and longitude coordinates from Argos Data Collection Systems via email.  The information was entered into an Excel spreadsheet and converted to UTM format for plotting locations on maps.  Additional information collected included animal ID and VHF frequency, receiving satellite, location class, and the number of times the satellite received information during its pass.  Only satellite locations of class level 1 (<100 m accuracy), 2 (100-500 m), and 3 (500

to 1000 m) were considered useful for incorporating in the project databases, as all other classes were too low in accuracy to consider.

## 3.5. Population Surveys

In addition to monthly telemetry re-location data, aerial census and counts were conducted three times a year, during the spring calving in June, the fall rut in October, and again in late winter (February-March). During 2003, due to lack of funding, only the spring calving and fall rut counts were conducted.

Surveys conducted in the first half of June are intended to provide data on the productivity of the population – ie the number of calves produced. We can also follow each individual collared cow to monitor subsequent survival of the cow and calf in later surveys. Data  on group composition and habitat use is also collected.

In the fall (October), a population composition survey, or "rut count" is conducted. This provides information on the proportion of calves and bulls in the population over time, in order to identify population trends. It also permits us to follow calf survival from June.

In late winter – February or March, another survey or count gives important informatio on the populatoin size/status and on what habitats are being used at that time. It provides critical information on overwinter survival and recruitment of the calves, and information needed to assess population trends.

Surveys were of two basic kinds:

- conducting standard census counts and classification following pre-established set routes without the use of the radiotelemetry

- telemetry re-location, counting and classifying as many animals as possible within the study area, using the collared animals to relocate groups.


As per provincial standards, the following information was collected during aerial census surveys: Observation #, Species, Tag ID if applicable, Time, Group Total, Age, Sex, UTM, Activity (*e.g.,* feeding), Visual, Habitat and other comments.

## 3.6. Mortalities and Habitat Use Investigations

Re-location data was attempted at least monthly to monitor movements of the collared caribou and status (alive or dead).  Collars were programmed to emit a mortality signal following no movement for 6 hours.  A mortality signal was twice as fast as the regular (alive) beep and therefore distinct.  When a mortality signal was detected the site was visited as soon as possible in order to determine the cause of death (*i.e.,* species of predator).  If left too long it is extremely difficult to determine the cause of death because of the number of other animals that are quickly attracted to the carcass.

At each mortality investigation a detailed form was completed containing information on cause of death, date of death, sex, age, ID#, snow depth, photographs, and comments on the circumstances and surroundings.  A tooth from the animals was collected where possible, and

sent to the provincial veterinarian (Helen Schwantje, MELP, Victoria) for aging. The radio collars were recovered for re-use.

During aerial surveys, habitat use investigations were conducted at a few sites that telemetry indicated were being utilized by the caribou. Habitat assessments were completed for each site visited, and a GPS location was recorded. Additional ground surveys, based by combinations of truck, snowmobile, foot, and horse, were conducted at a small number of sites to collect further tlemetry data and habitat use investigations.

### 3.7. Seasonal Use Patterns

Three types of location data were collected during this project for assessment of seasonal use patterns: 1) VHF telemetry signals from collared caribou collected by fixed wing flights (monthly when weather permitted), and helicopter; 2) ARGOS satellite signals from three VHF/ARGOS collars; and 3) visual locations collected for marked and unmarked animals during census flights conducted in June (calving), October (rut), and February-March (late winter).

For seasonal analysis of the data, points were classified according to one of six categories:

- Spring (April 1$^{st}$ to May 31$^{st}$)
- Calving (June 1$^{st}$ to June 30$^{th}$)
- Summer (July 1$^{st}$ to September 15$^{th}$)
- Fall/Rut (September 16$^{th}$ to October 31$^{st}$)
- Early Winter (November 1$^{st}$ to December 31$^{st}$)
- Late Winter (January 1$^{st}$ to March 31$^{st}$)

### 3.8. Data Entry

All field data has been entered into appropriate spreadsheets and databases such as Excel (*e.g.,* telemetry locations, census data, etc.) and Venus (for vegetation plots). Separate spreadsheets were used for census, telemetry, and habitat data. Original completed field forms were photocopied and stored in a binder as a back-up reference. Site locations were translated for use in ArcView 3.1 in order to illustrate plot locations and animal movements.

### 3.9. Progress Reports

During each year of the project, progress reports were submitted to the MKTF to summarize and communicate results and to track expenditures. In addition to the progress reports, an annual data report was provided in March 2001, 2002, and 2003.

## 4.0  HABITAT MAPPING

### 4.1.1.  Introduction

One of the key challenges for this project has been in developing a consistent and appropriate habitat map base across the area to support the caribou work. The following sub-sections describe the approach and process of creating broad Caribou Habitat Units (CHU's) from the existing ecosystem mapping in the Muskwa-Kechika Management Area. With a limited budget and a need for a seamless map base to support future interpretations and analyses, we decided to overcome the mapping hurdle by running a form of broad ecosystem mapping, using previous plot data from the caribou study, and prior projects in and around the area. Our approach involved utilizing all of the existing ecosystem mapping projects, grouping the units into broader caribou habitat units, then using BEC, TRIM, LANDSAT 7, and other data sources to run this caribou habitat mapping for the missing area (an area of over 280,000 hectares). Thus the mapping now depicts the caribou habitat units for the whole area (i.e. for over 890,000 hectares), giving fairly consistent coverage, but the original dataset remains nested within this, with all of the detail available from the PEM and TEM mapping, where there is coverage.

The actual habitat units are described in Appendix 1. A more detailed methodology of mapping CHU's in areas with no existing ecosystem mapping is intended as the subject of a subsequent report.

### 4.1.2.  Existing Ecosystem Mapping

Relatively detailed ecosystem mapping, at scales of 1:20,000 to 1:50,000, covers about 70% of the study area.  The different mapping projects are summarized in the Table 1.

About 15% of the area had previously had Terrestrial Ecosystem Mapping (TEM) completed at a scale of 1:50,000 (Madrone Consultants Ltd. 1999); some 50% of the area was mapped in 2001-2002 in three separate predictive ecosystem mapping (PEM) projects by EBA; and another 8% had PEM mapping completed in 2003 by Madrone Environmental Services Ltd. and Atticus. The remainder (about 27% of the caribou study area) was entirely unmapped; there was also no forest cover or other vegetation mapping for any of this area, limiting our options for developing a PEM. There was also insufficient budget for a full PEM using air photo interpretation for bioterrain.

**Table 1: Ecosystem mapping in the Muskwa-Kechika Management Area.**

| Type of map | % Area | Contractor | Year Completed | % of study area |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Terrestrial Ecosystem Map (TEM) | Dunedin River | Madrone | 1998 | 15% |
| Predictive Ecosystem Map (PEM) | Toad, Racing, & McDonald rivers | EBA Engineering | 2002 | 50% |
| Predictive Ecosystem Map (PEM) | Gataga River | Atticus/Madrone | 2003 | 8% |

### 4.1.3. Biogeoclimatic Units

The basic unit of most ecosystem mapping under 1:50,000 (including TEM and PEM) is the biogeoclimatic site series, stratified by biogeoclimatic subzones and variants. The Biogeoclimatic classification of the area, thus provides the basic framework for developing the habitat mapping. The biogeoclimatic subzones and variants that occur within the study area, and a brief description, are listed in Table 2, and illustrated in Figure 2. In the areas where TEM or PEM mapping occurs, additional information contained within the map databases includes bioterrain, vegetation structural stage, and site modifiers.

**Table 2: Biogeoclimatic units of the study area.**

| BEC zone | Subzones | Elev. | Location | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black and White Boreal Spruce (BWBS) | Dry cool (BWBSdk) | 600 – 1000 m | Found in western parts of the study area, below the SWBmk | Climate is drier and cooler than the BWBSmw2, forests dominated by Sw and Pl, aspen found on warm aspects and on burnt areas |
| | Moist warm (BWBSmw2) | 600 – 1100 m | Occupies rolling topography on lower elevations on eastern flanks of the northern Rockies | High aspen component; longer growing season than BWBSwk3 |
| | Wet cool (BWBSwk3) | 600 – 1100 m | Found on foothills and lower to mid slopes of northern Rockies | Dominated by Sw and Pl |
| Spruce-Willow-Birch (SWB) | Moist cool (SWBmk) | 1000-1300 | Middle elevations of northern Rocky Mountains | Subalpine zone above BWBS; open forests, mixed with shrublands |
| | Moist cool scrub (SWBmks) | 1300-1600 | Middle-upper elevations of northern Rocky Mountains | Transitional to AT, shrub and grasslands |
| Alpine Tundra (AT) | | > 1600 | All high elevation areas | Tundra, rock and ice |

**Figure 2: Biogeoclimatic Units of the Study Area**

### 4.1.4.  Plot Data Sources

In order to develop and improve the habitat modeling, detailed vegetation plots were conducted.  Priority was given to areas of use to the south of the Alaska Highway, as there were very few detailed vegetation plots in that part of the study area.

Data from vegetation plots done in the study were drawn from two projects:

- plots done during the caribou surveys (80 plots)

- plots from the Gataga PEM project (96 plots)

In September of 2001, 38 plots were completed in the study area. During September 2002, four biologists conducted additional habitat surveys within the study area, within the Wokkpash and Racing River Areas, to add to the existing vegetation database. In addition, another 42 GIF plots (as well as 54 visuals) were completed just to the south, within the Gataga, during a separate PEM mapping exercise jointly conducted by Madrone and Atticus. This vegetation data was also highly applicable to the area. These plots were classified to ecosystems, but also into the broader Caribou Habitat Units (see below), and the information was used to calibrate the Caribou Habitat map for the study area.

### 4.1.5.  Caribou Habitat Units

Although most ecosystem mapping is based on site series, it is difficult to correlate caribou use of habitats to these units which, in many cases, occupy small areas on the landscape. Instead, caribou appear to favor more general, larger habitats that share similar structural stages or aspects (Pojar 1986.).   Such habitats (*e.g.,* tundra or north-facing open forest) will have several site series nested within them.  For example, the closed forest type might include within it areas of drier pine forest and mesic forests dominated by white spruce or subalpine fir. A review was done on existing documentation describing caribou habitat in different locations in northern BC, ranging from Spatsizi Park, Cassiar Mountains, Rocky Mountain Trench, and northern Rocky Mountains. Based on these documents, the major habitat types associated with Caribou in the north appear to be  the following:

- Closed forest
- Open forest
- Moist to wet forest (TEM and PEM areas only)
- Wetlands
- Grasslands
- Shrub and scrub
- Tundra
- Sparsely vegetated (rock, cliff)
- Wetlands and rivers
- Permanent snow

The BEC site series used in the different mapping projects (TEM, PEM) were grouped into the above categories.  Thus the classification is primarily a physiognomic, or structural stage

grouping. However there are ecological affinities within each of the groups. The closed forest groups, for example, are circum-mesic, ranging from slightly dry to moist. Once selected, the site series groupings were entered into a project-specific database. All mapped ecosystem units from all of the included projects were correlated with these Caribou Habitat Units. Database manipulations included the "search and replacing" of ecosystem map codes, the use of site modifiers (assumed and mapped) to model aspect, and creating new themes. Maps were created and viewed in ArcView.

### 4.1.6.  Refining the Mapping

Feedback from a brief field review of the initial satellite mapping in the summer of 2003 was used to refine the new mapping for the missing area and run another iteration. We also smoothed out various edge matching problems between all the different mapping projects. Office based QA of the mapping using orthophotos for the area, as well as checking against prior plot data, was also done.

### 4.1.7.  Habitat Map Limitations

Creating a generalized classification is by nature a simplification of the landscape, with an accompanying loss of information.  A map of the BHU's does not have the same amount of information associated with each polygon that an ecosystem map at 1:20,000 has.  However, drawing on the existing ecological information available for each site series contained within each grouping, one can nevertheless make some conclusions about the attributes of each BHU.

The database BHU groupings that were made selected only the dominant site series per polygon, with the result that the less common site series are not recognized.  For example, in a terrestrial ecosystem map polygon with the label **6BL 3WV 1FE**, only the BL would have been used in the grouping of site series ecosystems, and WV and FE would not be mapped, in spite of the fact that these "remainder" units may be valuable habitat.  Site series that are rarely the dominant unit in a polygon will therefore be under-represented in the final map product.  Of course, the original maps are always there if more detailed analysis is required.

Another issue concerned certain ecosystem units, which could have been classified into two different BHU's.  An example is a forested bog, which could be classified as either a wetland or wet forest.

Obviously the area without original air photo interpretation does not achieve as high a quality of habitat mapping as the areas that had the benefit of bioterrain mapping (i.e. direct air photo interpretation), and there is of course room for improvement. It is hoped that at some point budget may be available to run a final field test/QA followed by a final iteration of the mapping. However, due to budgetary constraints, the product is currently being used as the basis for analyses.

**Figure 3: Caribou Habitat Units of the Study Area**

# 5.0 CARIBOU DATA

## 5.1. Capture and Collaring

During Oct 22$^{nd}$ to Oct 25$^{th}$, 2000 Northern Mountain Helicopters (Zvonko Dancevik and Grant Lordie) assisted by Madrone Consultants Ltd. (Gillian Radcliffe and Tania Tripp) and Slocan Fort Nelson (Mary Duda) completed the initial collaring project goal of 30 female caribou from the Muskwa caribou herd. Animals were captured from selected sites distributed throughout the study area; concentrated in the McDonald Creek, Flowering Lake, Nonda Creek, Tetsa River, Henry Creek, Ram Creek and Dunedin River areas (Madrone 2001).

An additional 11 animals were collared on October 21$^{st}$ and 22$^{nd}$, 2001 by Talon Helicopters (Zvonko Dancevic and Brad Culling), assisted by Madrone Consultants Ltd. (Gillian Radcliffe, Tania Tripp and Jared Hobbs). Animals were captured in the Flowering Lake, Summit Lake, McDonald Creek, Eight Mile South of Tower and Yash Creek areas (Madrone 2002). No collaring was deemed necessary in 2002. A final collaring session took place in November of 2003. Five animals were collared by Brad Culling (net-gunner) and Zvonko Dancevik (QWEST Helicopters). Individual capture and collaring locations for all 46 animals are shown in Figure 4.

We had hoped to maintain a minimum of 25 collared animals over the duration of the project. However, while approx. 30 animals remained collared by the end of this year (2003-2004), only some 17 of these are ones we now consider "active". Inevitably there has been a dwindling of numbers of active collars as batteries fail or animals move right out of the study area altogether. Mortality was also higher in the second year than the first. We considered further collaring in winter 2002/2003, but decided the additional expense was not justified, at that time, given the number of active collars and that the field portion of the project was planned to wind-up in the fall of 2003. However, as the program could not be completed in 2003, we collared an additional five animals in fall of 2003, in an effort to keep the number of active collars over 20.

The overall condition of the 46 animals captured was fair to good. Body condition ratings (rump, ribs and withers) were given for 32 of the 46 animals. Pelage was brown and assessed as good for all animals. As well, minimal scarring was present on all 46 animals. Tooth wear was highly variable depending on the age of the animal. The data collected for each collared animal is presented in Appendix I.

**Figure 4: Original Collaring  Locations**

## 5.2. Biological Samples

As per Helen Schwantje (provincial veterinarian) and Bryan Webster's (BC Parks) request, we attempted to collected blood, hair and fecal samples for each collared animal for Provincial studies. We were successful in collecting a total of 43 blood, 45 hair and 43 fecal samples. Fecal samples were separated for parasite as well as possible dietary analysis. Results from parasitism analysis are not available at this time. No further analysis has been conducted at this time. However, blood samples and the data collected during collaring have been provided to a Ph.D. candidate studying large mammal genetics in northern B.C.

Four body measurements were collected during collaring in 2000: hind foot length, shoulder height, chest girth and total length. These same measurements were also collected again in 2001 and 2003 with the addition of neck girth. Measurements were taken as per *Hoofed Mammals of BC* page 77, figure 40 (Shackleton, 1999). Initial assessment of the measurements compares closely with those for woodland caribou cited in Shackleton (Table 3).

**Table 3: Measurements of Caribou in the Study Area Compared to Provincial Averages.**

| Measurement | Shackleton Citation<br>Mean (range) (sample size) | MK Measurements<br>Mean (range) (sample size) |
|---|---|---|
| Total Length – female | 200.7 cm (176-220) (n=70) | 212.5 cm (183-240) (n=45) |
| Hind Foot – female | 52.8 cm (38-66) (n=48) | 58.4 cm (52-65) (n=45) |
| Chest – female | 127.7 cm (118-144) (n=75) | 128.8 cm (115-140) (n=44) |
| Shoulder – female | 122.2 cm (103-139) (n=43) | 121.2 cm (100-138) (n=45) |
| Neck - female | * | **46.7 cm (44-56) (n=16) |

*Note: Neck girth is not given by Shackleton (1999).
**Note: Neck girth was not recorded in October 2000.

## 5.3. Caribou Relocation Data

### 5.3.1.  Satellite Re-location Surveys

Three Argos satellite collars were installed in October 2001.  Location information was received via e-mail on a daily basis, and included lat/long coordinates and an associated data quality class of 3, 2, 1, 0, A, B or Z (where 3 is the best signal class (accuracy within 100 m) and Z is no location determined).  In order to track the movements of the caribou only the better location classes (3, 2 or 1) were counted as satellite re-location points and used to plot distribution maps.  A total of 1508 satellite re-location points (location class 3, 2, or 1) were received during the monitoring (over 18 months) with the Argos collars (October 22, 2001 to April 8, 2003).  Collar ID 39M39 (Argos ID 20766 quit April 8, 2003) received 336 re-location points.  Collar ID 40M40 (Argos ID 14200 quit December 10, 2001) received 48 re-location points.  Collar ID 41M41 (Argos ID 26338 quit December 8, 2002) received 1124 re-location points (Table 6).

**Table 4:  Number of satellite re-locations for caribou with Argos collars, 2001-2003.**

| Animal ID | Satellite Location Class | | | Total # of Re-locations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | |
| 39M39 | 100 | 124 | 112 | 336 |
| 40M40 | 11 | 26 | 11 | 48 |
| 41M41 | 403 | 420 | 301 | 1124 |
| **Total** | **514** | **570** | **424** | **1508 data points** |

Figure 5 presents the satellite re-locations (classes 3, 2,1) for animals 39, 40 and 41. Unfortunately, all three collars are no longer functioning. The VHF transmitters continue to transmit, however, and we hope to relocate these animals and remove the collars during project completion (anticipated in 2004).

**Figure 5. Satellite Relocation Data**

## 5.4. Telemetry Re-location Surveys

### 5.4.1.  *Fixed-wing VHF re-locations*

Since the initial collaring in October 2000, 97 aerial telemetry flights (48 re-location sessions) have been conducted by fixed wing and by helicopter between November 2000 and March 2004.   A total of 878 VHF telemetry re-location points have been collected from aerial telemetry flights, with an average of 18.3 re-locations obtained per aerial survey session (~2 days of flying) (Table 4 and Figure 6).  The 30 caribou collared in 2000 have been re-located an average of 21.7 times per individual (range of 2 to 42), and the 11 caribou collared in 2001 have been re-located an average of 19.4 times per animal (range of 10 to 26). Aerial surveys were determined to be a relatively efficient means of tracking the animals on a regular basis.

Aerial sampling intervals for VHF re-locations ranged from 5 to >60 days among data sets. Stormy and windy conditions posed some logistical problems in the very mountainous study area, and surveys have had to be rather opportunistic, dictated to some degree by weather. They were therefore less regular than would be ideal.

Of the original 46 animals collared between 2000 and 2003, 12 collared animals were recently relocated (active) as of February, 2004; a total of 17 are considered active; two collars have dropped off; three collars have failed (*i.e.,* originally presumed missing but subsequently observed during fieldwork); an additional 13 collared animals are considered missing in action (no signal received for at least 6 months); and 11 have died. Table 5 indicates the status of the collared animals as of the end of February, 2004.

It is possible that the 'missing' animals have a home range that is outside of our study boundary, and therefore are not within the re-location survey area. In one case a cow caribou with a white collar was seen in a mountain area some 70 km north of the northern study area boundary. Subsequent efforts to relocate this cow were unsuccessful. In another case it took 6 months to re-locate an animal that had left the area right after capture and then returned. It could also be that the missing collared animals have faulty VHF transmitters, which prevents us from re-locating them.  We know this to be true for at least three caribou that have been visually re-located but the collars did not emit any signal, and hence the transmitters had clearly failed.

**Table 5: Aircraft type, flight dates, and number of animals detected.**

| Aircraft | Flight Dates | # of Animals Re-located |
|---|---|---|
| Helicopter | October 22-25, 2000 | 30 Captured & Collared |
| Fixed Wing | November 14 & 19, 2000 | 12 |
| Fixed Wing | November 27 & 29, 2000 | 27 |
| Fixed Wing | December 27-29, 2000 | 27 |
| Fixed Wing | January 10 & 12, 2001 | 12 |
| Fixed Wing | January 17, 2001 | 15 |
| Helicopter | January 25 and 27, 2001 | 24 |
| Fixed Wing | March 13 & 14, 2001 | 26 |
| Helicopter | March 24, 25 & 27, 2001 | 23 |
| Fixed Wing | April 10 & 11, 2001 | 26 |
| Fixed Wing | April 26 & 27, 2001 | 25 |
| Fixed Wing | May 7 & 10, 2001 | 23 |
| Fixed Wing | May 24 & 25, 2001 | 25 |
| Fixed Wing | June 6 & 7, 2001 | 24 |
| Fixed Wing | June 12 & 13, 2001 | 25 |
| Fixed Wing | June 29 & 30, 2001 | 18 |
| Fixed Wing | July 12 & 21 | 19 |
| Fixed Wing | July 29 & 31 | 18 |
| Fixed Wing | August 13 &14, 2001 | 18 |
| Fixed Wing | August 29 & 30, 2001 | 20 |
| Helicopter | October 20, 2001 | 3 |
| Helicopter | October 21 & 22, 2001 | 11 Captured & Collared |
| Fixed Wing | December 13 & 15, 2001 | 22 |
| Fixed Wing | January 13, 2002 | 14 |
| Fixed Wing | January 29 & 31, 2002 | 25 |
| Fixed Wing | February 18, 2002 | 8 |
| Helicopter | February 20, 21 & 22, 2002 | 26 |
| Fixed Wing | February 21 & 23, 2002 | 16 |
| Fixed Wing | March 21 & 22, 2002 | 25 |
| Fixed Wing | May 6 & 7, 2002 | 26 |
| Fixed Wing | May 22 & 23, 2002 | 23 |
| Fixed Wing | June 2 & 3, 2002 | 21 |
| Helicopter | June 10 & 11, 2002 | 23 |
| Fixed Wing | July 6 & 7, 2002 | 20 |
| Fixed Wing | July 23 & 24, 2002 | 15 |
| Fixed Wing | Aug. 30 & Sept. 5, 2002 | 16 |
| Fixed Wing | September 11 & 12, 2002 | 15 |
| Helicopter | October 23 & 24, 2002 | 18 |
| Fixed Wing | Nov. 23 & Dec. 4, 2002 | 14 |
| Fixed Wing | February 2 & 5, 2003 | 13 |
| Helicopter | March 5, 6, 7, 2003 | 12 |
| Fixed Wing | March 24 & 25, 2003 | 11 |
| Helicopter | June 15 & 16, 2003 | 20 |
| Fixed Wing | Sep 21 & 30, 2003 | 11 |
| Helicopter | Oct 25 & 26, 2003 | 9 |
| Helicopter | Nov 11, 2003 | 5 Captured & Collared |
| Fixed Wing | Dec 14, 2003 | 6 |
| Fixed Wing | February 24 & 25, 2004 | 13 |
| **Total** | **Days = 97** | **Data points = 878** |

**Table 6: Status of Caribou Collared During 2000-2003.**

| Tag ID | Frequency | Collaring Date | # of Re-locations | Last Re-location Date | Current Collar Status |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1M1 | 148.300 | Oct 22, 2000 | 10 | May 25, 2001 | mortality |
| 2M2 | 148.328 | Oct 23, 2000 | 19 | Oct 24, 2002 | no signal |
| 3M3 | 148.353 | Oct 24, 2000 | 33 | November 23, 2002 | missing |
| 4M4 | 148.375 | Oct 24, 2000 | 30 | June 12, 2002 | mortality |
| 5M5 | 148.401 | Oct 23, 2000 | 13 | June 29, 2001 | missing |
| 6M6 | 148.419 | Oct 22, 2000 | 9 | Oct 23, 2002 | no signal |
| 7M7 | 148.452 | Oct 24, 2000 | 18 | Aug 30, 2001 | missing |
| 8M8 | 148.478 | Oct 23, 2000 | 34 | June 15, 2003 | missing |
| 9M9 | 148.501 | Oct 23, 2000 | 38 | February 25, 2004 | weak signal |
| 10M10 | 148.525 | Oct 22, 2000 | 42 | February 24, 2004 | active |
| 11M11 | 148.552 | Oct 23, 2000 | 24 | December 4, 2002 | missing |
| 12M12 | 148.577 | Oct 22, 2000 | 42 | February 24, 2004 | active |
| 13M13 | 148.602 | Oct 22, 2000 | 14 | October 25, 2003 | no signal |
| 14M14 | 148.626 | Oct 23, 2000 | 17 | June 11, 2002 | missing |
| 15M15 | 148.651 | Oct 23, 2000 | 4 | Dec 29, 2000 | mortality |
| 16M16 | 148.677 | Oct 24, 2000 | 20 | Aug 29, 2001 | missing |
| 17M17 | 148.700 | Oct 22, 2000 | 29 | July 23, 2002 | mortality |
| 18M18 | 148.725 | Oct 24, 2000 | 20 | June 15, 2003 | weak signal |
| 19M19 | 148.753 | Oct 25, 2000 | 5 | Jan 27, 2001 | missing |
| 20M20 | 148.776 | Oct 22, 2000 | 28 | July 23, 2002 | mortality |
| 21M21 | 148.802 | Oct 22, 2000 | 33 | June 15, 2003 | missing |
| 22M22 | 148.825 | Oct 24, 2000 | 2 | Nov 29, 2000 | mortality |
| 23M23 | 148.850 | Oct 24, 2000 | 25 | May 6, 2002 | missing |
| 24M24 | 148.876 | Oct 24, 2000 | 38 | October 25, 2003 | active |
| 25M25 | 148.902 | Oct 25, 2000 | 14 | June 29, 2001 | mortality |
| 26M26 | 148.926 | Oct 25, 2000 | 16 | Aug 29, 2001 | missing |
| 27M27 | 148.953 | Oct 24, 2000 | 16 | Feb 22, 2002 | dropped |
| 28M28 | 148.976 | Oct 24, 2000 | 22 | May 22, 2002 | mortality |
| 29M29 | 149.001 | Oct 24, 2000 | 11 | May 25, 2001 | dropped |
| 30M30 | 149.028 | Oct 25, 2000 | 27 | October 25, 2003 | active |
| 31M31 | 148.298 | Oct 21, 2001 | 13 | Aug 30, 2002 | mortality |
| 32M32 | 148.312 | Oct 21, 2001 | 22 | February 25, 2004 | active |
| 33M33 | 148.341 | Oct 21, 2001 | 23 | October 25, 2003 | false mortality |
| 34M34 | 148.388 | Oct 21, 2000 | 14 | Oct 23, 2002 | mortality |
| 35M35 | 148.651 | Oct 21, 2001 | 22 | February 25, 2004 | active |
| 36M36 | 148.827 | Oct 21, 2001 | 10 | May 22, 2002 | mortality |
| 37M37 | 148.902 | Oct 21, 2001 | 26 | February 24, 2004 | active |
| 38M38 | 149.002 | Oct 21, 2001 | 25 | February 24, 2004 | active |
| 39M39 | 149.299 | Oct 21, 2001 | 13 (336!) | July 23, 2002 | missing |
| 40M40 | 149.100 | Oct 21, 2001 | 27 (48!) | February 24, 2004 | vhf active |
| 41M41 | 149.200 | Oct 22, 2001 | 19 (1124!) | Sept 30, 2003 | vhf active |

**Table 6 (cont'd): Status of Caribou Collared During 2000-2003.**

| Tag ID | Frequency | Collaring Date | # of Re-locations | Last Re-location Date | Current Collar Status |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 42M42 | 148.953 | Nov 11, 2003 | 3 | February 24, 2004 | active |
| 43M43 | 148.975 | Nov 11, 2003 | 2 | February 24, 2004 | weak signal |
| 44M44 | 148.700 | Nov 11, 2003 | 2 | February 24, 2004 | weak signal |
| 45M45 | 148.375 | Nov 11, 2003 | 2 | February 24, 2004 | active |
| 46M46 | 148.826 | Nov 11, 2003 | 2 | February 24, 2004 | active |
| | | **Total # of VHF Re-locations** | **878** | | **Mortalities = 11** |
| | | | | | **Dropped Collars = 2** |
| | | | | | **No signal = 3** |
| | | | | | **Missing for >6 months = 13** |
| | | | | | **Active collars = 17** |
| | | | | | **Total collars = 46** |

\* Date in brackets refers to last time VHF signal was heard
! refers to number of Argos Satellite re-locations

## 5.5. Helicopter Surveys

In addition to VHF telemetry re-location flights, a series of detailed aerial survey flights were completed between 2000 and 2004 in order to characterize important life stages of the species. These were a spring cow/calf survey in June, a fall rut count (October), and a late winter population survey (between January and March). The late winter survey was not conducted in 2004 due to lack of funds, however, a fixed wing flight was conducted in February.

An overview of the location data collected from the fixed wing VHF telemetry surveys and from the helicopter surveys combined is presented in Figure 6. This gives a good visual overview of the overall range and core areas of caribou activity within the study area, but does not distinguish between seasonal uses or different years.

**Figure 6: VHF Relocation Data – Overview**

## 5.6. Home Range and Habitat Use Analyses

Detailed seasonal and individual habitat analyses have not yet been completed, as the focus in the past year has been on completing the habitat map base. The broad habitat unit base map is now complete and ready for the final project stage of project: habitat analysis, home range estimates, seasonal habitat models, and recommendations for inclusion in pre-tenure plans.

Initial data from year one showed that animals moved highly variable distances between re-locations, with some animals moving great distances and others remaining close to where they were originally captured. Distances were measured direct between points in km using ArcView 3.1 (underestimating the actual distances moved). Initial observations are borne out by subsequent data collection. Indeed, preliminary assessments appear to suggest that the animals fall into one of three groups:

- Animals that range widely and appear to show little fidelity to seasonal ranges; their movements are unpredictable and highly variable

- Ones that also range widely, making long distance movements, but show considerable fidelity to either calving and/or wintering ranges, travelling long distances to return to the same general areas at these times;

- Animals that generally stay within a much smaller range, usually within one watershed, utilizing different elevations at different times, but never making long distance movements.

With inclusion of data from the cow-calf and fall rut census surveys in 2003, three years of data covering each season, are available on which to base analyses of home ranges, travel corridors, and seasonal habitat requirements.

### 5.6.1. Calving habitat

Calving occurs at relatively high elevations in the mountains. Cows with new calves are typically found in high alpine valleys, which are generally steep-sided, with abundant talus. Individual cows appear to head even higher up onto fairly steep slopes, often on talus, to actually give birth. They then rejoin the other females in the valley directly below where they calve.

Figure 7 illustrates one site where a cow was observed calving. From our observations in the study area this appears to be fairly typical calving habitat. Figure 8 illustrates caribou re-locations during the calving season (June 1st to June 31st), in relation to the overall study area, and also in relation to the Sulphur-Eight Mile Pre-tenure Planning Area.

**Figure 7: Typical Alpine Calving Habitat**

**Figure 8: VHF Relocation Data, Calving Season**

As for calving habitats, detailed habitat analyses of fall and winter habitats have not yet been completed. However, with the habitat base now complete, in conjunction with the rutting season and winter relocations, this can be used to more adequately characterize the seasonal ranges and habitats. Figure 9 illustrates the VHF fixed wing and helicopter census data collected during the late winter  for the study area, and in relation to the Sulphur-Eight Mile Pre-tenure Planning Area boundary.

### 5.6.2.  Travel Corridors

Information collected to date has helped to clarify which valleys receive high caribou use and when and where main caribou movements occur.  For example, data suggests that there are a number of well-used travel corridors in the study area, especially the valleys of the Wokkpash River, Nonda, and Eight Mile Creek.

## 5.7. Population, Sex Ratios, and Cow-Calf Ratios

This section presents summary information from the different surveys. Data are grouped by survey type,  followed by a brief discussion summarizing the 2003 data. Detailed analyses of the data has yet to be undertaken, and observations are very preliminary and based on initial, uncorrected data only. As no late winter survey was completed in the 2003-2004 year, data for this season is not included (see earlier reports for prior years data).

During an initial reconnaissance census survey over a portion of the current study area in mid-February, 2000, prior to research initiation, 344 animals were counted (not including the Nonda Creek area) over a 4.5-hour period.  On average the number of animals counted per fall rut census (n = 4) was 469 animals (range of 288-658); for the late winter (n = 6) it was 288 (range of 191-455); and for the spring cow/calf census (n = 3) it was 462 (range of 401-520).  During all helicopter survey flights we attempted to classify the animals by age class and sex, to provide basic demographic information.

Effort spent during each of the surveys varied depending upon a variety of factors, including number of caribou observed, time spent searching for collared individuals, and weather and flying conditions. Upon future analysis we anticipate that flying time can be expected to explain some of the variations observed. The average time spent on surveys was approximately 5.5 hours during the fall rut surveys, 10.5 during the winter surveys, and 8.16 hours to complete the spring calving surveys (Table 7).

Table 7 presents the radio telemetry survey data for the 2003 cow-calf survey, and includes the prior two years of data also for comparison. In this past year (2003) the total number of adult cows observed was 271, an increase over prior years, although only 14 of these animals (5.2%) had radio collars. The proportion of collared animals in the sample was much higher in the prior two years (15.7% and 13.5 % in 2001 and 2002 respectively).

**Figure 9:  VHR Relocation Data, Late Winter**

**Table 7: Demographic Information Collected During Spring Calving Survey Flights 2000 - 2003.**

| Month | Year | Day(s) | Adult | | | | Juvenile | | | | | Total # | # Collars located |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Male | Fem. | Unid. | Total | Male | Fem. | Unid. | Calves | Total | | |
| *Spring - Cow/Calf Census* | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| June | 2001 | 12th & 13th | 53 | 159 | 116 | 328 | 2 | - | 8 | 128 | 138 | **466** | 25 |
| June | 2002 | 10th & 11th | 36 | 164 | 54 | 254 | 15 | 10 | 22 | 101 | 148 | **402** | 22 |
| June | 2003 | 15th & 16th | 26 | 271 | 15 | 312 | 28 | 58 | 38 | 84 | 208 | **520** | 14 |
| | | **Total** | **115** | **594** | **185** | **894** | **45** | **68** | **68** | **313** | **494** | **1388** | **61** |
| | | Ave. | 38.33 | 198.00 | 61.67 | 298.00 | 15.00 | 22.67 | 22.67 | 104.33 | 164.67 | 462.67 | 20.33 |
| | | SD | 13.65 | 63.27 | 50.93 | 38.94 | 13.00 | 33.94 | 15.01 | 22.19 | 37.86 | 59.07 | |
| **Total for all census surveys** | | | **824** | **2477** | **357** | **3658** | **188** | **262** | **196** | **436** | **1082** | **5084** | **184** |
| **Average for all census surveys** | | | 63.38 | 190.54 | 27.46 | 281.38 | 14.46 | 20.15 | 15.08 | 87.20 | 83.23 | 363.14 | 15.33 |

In the first year of surveys (2001) some yearlings may have been included in with the adults, as they can be difficult to distinguish reliably by this time.

Calf numbers in 2003 were 84, lower than in prior years, giving a calf:cow ratio of only 31 calves per 100 cows. This compares to 62 calves per 100 cows in the previous year, and 81 calves per 100 cows in 2001. On first glance this would appear to indicate an alarming downward trend in productivity. However, in the first summer a relatively large number of animals (116) were classified as unsexed adults, and assuming the great majority were female, this would substantially alter the calf:cow ratios. Nevertheless, if the data is corrected each year to allocate unclassified adults by the bull:cow ratio found in the classified animals, the resulting calf:cow ratios still show a decline, from 54 in 2001, to 34 in 2002, and only 29 in 2003. The data does therefore appear to suggest a declining productivity. However, more in-depth analysis is needed before any real trends and levels of significance can be determined. As some calves die very soon after parturition, our estimates for calf production from aerial surveys should be considered minimal.

Table 8 presents data from the fall rut count in 2003, plus the previous years results for comparison. This count provides a better measure of bull:cow ratios than the spring data. From this, adult sex ratios appear fairly stable, ranging from 28 bulls per 100 cows in 2001, to 32 in 2002, and 31 in 2003.

**Table 8: Demographic Information Collected During Fall Survey Flights 2000 - 2003.**

| ~Time (hrs) Month | Year | Day(s) | Adult | | | | Juvenile | | | | | Total # | # Collars located |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Male | Fem. | Unid. | Total | Male | Fem. | Unid. | Calves | Total | | |
| *Fall Rut Census* | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| October | 2000 | 25th | 86 | 154 | 5 | 245 | 11 | 28 | 4 | - | 43 | **288** | n/a |
| October | 2001 | 20th | 114 | 414 | 31 | 559 | 46 | 28 | 25 | - | 99 | **658** | 7 |
| October | 2002 | 23rd & 24th | 100 | 308 | 1 | 409 | 26 | 15 | 4 | 65 | 110 | **519** | 16 |
| October | 2003 | 25th & 26th | 69 | 221 | 16 | 306 | 16 | 22 | 9 | 58 | 105 | **411** | 11 |
| | | **Total** | **369** | **1097** | **53** | **1519** | **99** | **93** | **42** | **123** | **357** | **1876** | **34** |
| | | Ave. | 92.25 | 274.25 | 13.25 | 379.75 | 24.75 | 23.25 | 10.50 | 30.75 | 89.25 | 469.00 | 11.33 |
| | | SD | 19.26 | 112.49 | 13.43 | 137.34 | 15.48 | 6.18 | 9.95 | 4.95 | 31.16 | 157.42 | |
| **Total for all census surveys** | | | **824** | **2477** | **357** | **3658** | **188** | **262** | **196** | **436** | **1082** | **5084** | **184** |
| **Average for all census surveys** | | | 63.38 | 190.54 | 27.46 | 281.38 | 14.46 | 20.15 | 15.08 | 87.20 | 83.23 | 363.14 | 15.33 |

In 2000 and 2001, the juveniles counted in the fall were the calves of that year (i.e. four months old), while in the subsequent two years, with greater experience, observers were often able to separate the yearlings from the prior year. These juveniles (in 2002 and 2003) are thus about 16 months old, and should likely be incorporated as young adults in analyses.

A fall population with 30 to 35 calves for every 100 cows, and over 35 bulls for every 100 cows, is considered to be stable (Woodland Caribou Guidelines 1996, cited in Kuzyk and Farnell 1997). However, our data shows a calf:cow ratio of less than 30:100 each year. In 2002, our survey identified only 21 calves per 100 cows in the population, and in 2003, 26 calves per 100 cows were recorded. In both cases there would appear to be some cause for concern. However, again, further data analysis is required at this stage.

A late winter population survey was not conducted in 2003-2004 due to lack of funding.

### 5.8. Mortality

Of the 11 known mortalities that have occurred over the period of this study, two occurred during the first fiscal year (October, 2000 to March, 2001), another two in the second fiscal year (April, 2001 to March, 2002), seven in this third fiscal year (April, 2002 to March, 2003), and none in the fourth (April, 2003 to March, 2004) (Table 8).

**Table 9:  Known Mortalities of Collared Caribou.**

| Collar Date | Tag ID | Mortality Date | # Months Collared | # Locations Obtained | Likely Cause of Death |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| October 22, 2000 | 22M22 | Nov 29, 2000 | 1 | 2 | Wolf predation |
| October 22, 2000 | 15M15 | Dec 29, 2000 | 2 | 4 | Undetermined |
| October 22, 2000 | 1M1 | May 25, 2001 | 7 | 10 | Undetermined |
| October 22, 2000 | 25M25 | June 29, 2001 | 9 | 14 | Undetermined |
| October 22, 2000 | 36M36 | May 22, 2002 | 18 | 9 | Grizzly bear |
| October 21, 2001 | 28M28 | May 22, 2002 | 7 | 22 | Wolf/Grizzly bear |
| October 22, 2000 | 4M4 | June 12, 2002 | 19 | 30 | Breech birth |
| October 22, 2000 | 17M17 | July 23, 2002 | 20 | 28 | Vehicle |
| October 22, 2000 | 20M20 | July 23, 2002 | 20 | 28 | Undetermined - collar not recovered |
| October 21, 2001 | 31M31 | Aug 30, 2002 | 10 | 12 | Undetermined - collar not recovered |
| October 21, 2001 | 34M34 | Oct 23, 2002 | 12 | 13 | Wolf predation |

During the first season of tracking collared caribou, two mortalities were investigated.  The mortality in November of 2000 was a result of wolf predation.  The cause of another mortality in December was unknown.  The animal was completely consumed by the time we were able to reach it, more than a month after the mortality signal was first detected.  Poor weather conditions and difficult access prevented us from investigating the mortality sooner.  Two more of the collared animals died in the spring (May and June, 2001), with cause of death undetermined.

In early June, 2002 we retrieved collars from animals #4, #28 and #36. One cow (#4) had died during calving; possibly a breech birth. She had been observed alive on June 10th high on a mountain slope, on a tiny shelf on an otherwise relatively steep talus/rock face. She was giving birth at that time but appeared to be having difficulty in the delivery. She had been a healthy young female when collared in fall 2000.

**Figure 10: Caribou Mortality, Animal #4**. **(note poor condition, loose collar)**

Animal Number 28 died south of Wokkpash Lake, and had been fed on by both wolves and bear. Number 36 died in the Tetsa River area, of uncertain cause but likely by predators, then was washed down the river for a kilometer or so. Animal #17 was killed by vehicle on the Alaska Highway. Two additional mortalities detected in July and August 2002 could not be located as the signal had stopped transmitting between detection of mortality signals from a fixed wing and subsequent helicopter based investigation. In October of 2002 another animal appeared to have been predated by wolves.

In summary, from October 22, 2000 to October 22, 2001, 30 animals were collared of which 4 mortalities (13%) were confirmed. From October 2001 to 2002, 37 animals were collared, and 7 died (~19% mortality). Animal survival from October 2002 to 2003 improved greatly, with 0% mortality detected. Thirteen of the collared animals, however, were and still are "Missing In Action" (*i.e.,* not relocated for 6 consecutive months). In addition, three collars are no longer transmitting a signal, four others have very weak signals (barely detectable hovering over the animal), and one has a false mortality signal that requires visual confirmation of status. Some of these missing animals are likely dead.

An additional five mortalities of caribou without collars were investigated during the study, and included two road kills adjacent to the highway. Another mortality was an adult bull caribou located along the edge of a frozen lake during the fall rut census. Judging from the well-worn teeth, and what was left of the body, the animal was likely an old bull in poor condition that died of natural causes. There was no evidence of wolf or coyote scavenging around the carcass, as it was relatively intact. During vegetation work for the SBW and AT classification project by Madrone, an intact adult skeleton was located in the Alpine Tundra. Cause of death was undetermined. As well, during ground surveys for caribou in January

2001 one mortality was observed adjacent to a well-used wet mineral lick.  Cause of death was also undetermined.

.



**Figure 11: Caribou Mortality – Animal #36**

## 6.0  PROJECT COMPLETION/FUTURE DIRECTIONS

### 6.1. Using the Information

#### 6.1.1.  Public Information/Participation/Partners

Over the past three years we have attempted to disseminate project information to locals, industry, and government contacts through a series of public presentations, a poster, and internet web-site information.  During the initial year of the project, Madrone Consultants Ltd. produced a project website linked to the main MK website (www.slocan.com\homepage.html).  Information specific to the Muskwa Caribou herd study, however, does not appear to be available through this site any longer.  Public presentations, using Power Point and slides, were conducted in Toad River (2001 and 2002) and Fort St. John (2002).  In addition, a poster was designed in 2001 to present at an Oil and Gas Conference in Fort Nelson. In addition to these products, regular progress reporting has been completed, as well as the year end data reports.  Information tailored to specific needs has also produced upon request.

#### 6.1.2.  Support for Other Projects

The data and products of this project are available to provide input into other studies, research, and management planning exercises. In addition to providing information for Pre-Tenure Planning (see below), prior project reports and information have also been provided to support a Conservation Area Design (CAD) exercise being conducted for the MK. The biological samples collected during caribou capture and collaring have been released by the provincial vet to Brian Churchill who is conducting a DNA study. This data will therefore hopefully serve a valuable purpose in contributing genetic information on northern caribou herds. We have also provided the data collected in conjunction with the capture and collaring, including locations, animal measurements and other observations, and this will hopefully support future analyses.

#### 6.1.3.  Management Applications

Development and management of the land and resources in the MKMA must be conducted in accordance with the Muskwa-Kechika Management Plan. Under this plan landscape level "pre-tenure planning" is a legislated pre-requisite before any oil and gas exploration, development or allocation can occur. The core study area for this caribou work covers all of Stone Mountain Resource Management Zone (RMZ) of  the Muskwa-Kechika, and the majority of the Eight Mile / Sulphur and Churchill RMZ's, both of which are  "Pre-tenure Planning Areas"  (PTP Areas 2 and 3 respectively).

Pre-tenure Planning is designed to identify sensitive issues that need to be considered in planning oil and gas development, and is intended to ensure the maintenance of identified values through managing the activities to minimize impacts, developing suitable mitigation

strategies, using appropriate technologies, and coordinating access planning and management. The Draft Guide to Pre-Tenure Planning identifies the key environmental deliverables of a pre-tenure plan as:

- An inventory of biophysical information and resource values and any associated objectives (descriptive and interpretive information), and

- A description and location of sensitive environmental values and the expected impacts of oil and gas development on these (evaluative information).

An important goal of this project is to collect information that will permit the evaluation of proposed development impacts, and that will provide a solid foundation for making decisions regarding caribou management in the area. Figures 8 and 9_ both show the Sulphur-Eight Mile Pre-Tenure planning boundary in relation to some of the caribou location data; the known calving areas and the late wintering areas. The maps thus illustrate highly sensitive areas where disturbance to the animals in June (for calving season), or in January to April (late winter season) would be especially detrimental.

This is just one illustration of how the information gained from this study can be applied in a management context, and when assessing potential impacts of proposed developments. Far more information is available form the large project dataset, but at this time lack of funding prevents further more detailed analyses and product development.

## 7.0 PROJECT COMPLETION/FUTURE RESEARCH

During the 2003/04 project period, the broad caribou habitat map was completed for the entire study area. The map will enable future habitat analysis for seasonal movements such as calving grounds, rut areas, and wintering habitat. Seasonal home range analysis in relation to habitats can now also be examined. This information will also permit us (subject to funding) to complete a habitat model for the study area.

Population data gathered during the initial three years of research is highly variable, and needs further detailed analyses to examine the significance of changes and identify any trends. Detailed analysis of the substantial data set for population size, demography and trends, including productivity rates and calf and adult survivorship, can now be completed (subject to funding). Analyses can also be conducted on other herd attributes such as group size by season, and seasonal home range fidelity. The completion of the habitat mapping base will provide the support for more detailed analyses of seasonal habitat preferences.

However, even after three and a half years, observations and trends must be considered preliminary in nature. Several more years of good field data collection are ideally needed to develop more reliable population estimates, detect trends, and gather an adequate picture of caribou habitat use, encompassing annual variability. Longer term studies are needed for large mammal populations such as this in order to accommodate year to year variability, and the fact that population responses to events, including weather and changes in predation, often take a number of years to be effected.

## 8.0 CONCLUSION

With the collaring of 46 caribou between October of 2000 and November 2003, three and a half years of regular telemetry data collection, and Caribou Habitat Mapping, is now completed. The project is now entering the final phase, which will focus on habitat analysis, with field data collection planned to terminate in the late fall of 2004, subject to funding availability.

Activities for this final year therefore primarily will focus on completion of a variety of in-progress activities, including completion of the habitat and range and use analyses. The following specific activities are proposed for project completion 2004/2005:

- Continue telemetry flights until end of October, 2004 (fixed wing flights once a month, in addition to two more helicopter survyes - spring 2004 and fall rut 2004). This would provide five years of fall rut and late winter data, and four years of spring calf/cow data.

- Complete habitat model for application to other pre-tenure areas using existing ecosystem data such as: CAD (Round River), TEM, and PEM

- Analyze data for habitat use and home range estimates for use in pre-tenure planning.

- Develop a monitoring program.

Data gathered during the three and a half years of research has solidly established movement and habitat use patterns in the area, and demographic data is giving preliminary indications of population trends. Although the field program is scheduled to terminate this fall, ideally several more years of good field data collection at a lower intensity, and periodic future monitoring, are needed to get adequate predictors of population trends. The habitat base should however be well established, and should only need periodic updates to reflect any major changes in habitat, such as large fires.

## 9.0  LITERATURE CITED

Atticus Resource Consulting Ltd. and Madrone Consultants Ltd. 2002. Predictive Ecosystem and Bioterrain Mapping for the Upper Gataga and Upper Akie-McCusker PTP areas. Report for the MKTF and MSRM, Fort St. John.

Barton, K. 2001. Subalpine and Alpine Ecosystems of the Muskwa-Kechika Management Area. Report and webpage compiled for Muskwa-Kechika Trust Fund by Madrone Consultants Ltd.

Barton, K., L. Veach, G. Radcliffe, and P. Williams.  1998. Terrestrial ecosystem mapping and wildlife interpretations for the Dunedin study area.  Report by Madrone Consultants Ltd. for Slocan Forest Products Ltd., Fort Nelson.

DeLong, C.  1990. A Field Guide for Identification and Interpretation of Ecosystems of the Northeast Portion of the Prince George Forest Region. Ministry of Forests.

Kuzyk, G.W. & R.S. Farnell. 1997. Woodland Caribou Studies in Central Yukon. Yukon Renewable Resources Fish and Wildlife Branch.

Madrone Consultants Ltd. 2001. 2000-2001 Year End Data Report: Caribou Populations and Ecology, Northern Muskwa-Kechika. Madrone Consultants Ltd. for the Muskwa-kechika Trust Fund, Fort St. John.

Madrone Consultants Ltd. 2002. 2001-2002 Year End Data Report: Caribou Populations and Ecology, Northern Muskwa-Kechika. Madrone Consultants Ltd. for the Muskwa-kechika Trust Fund, Fort St. John.

McKenzie, W. and J. Shaw. 2000.  Wetlands and related ecosystems of interior British Columbia.  BC Min. of Forests, Research Branch.

Min. of Env. 199-.  Broad Habitat Ecosystem units:  Central and Northern Forest Ecosystems

Pojar, J. 1986. Vegetation and Ungulate Habitat in the Gladys Lake Ecological Reserve, Northern BC.

Pojar, J. 199-.  Plant communities of the Spatsizi area. Unpublished notes.

Radcliffe, G.  2000.  Part I:  Caribou Populations and Ecology, Northern Muskwa-Kechika. *Prepared for* the MK Trust Fund, Fort Nelson, B.C. Prepared by Madrone Consultants Ltd., Prince George, B.C.

Radcliffe, G. and T. Goward.  2000.  Caribou and Lichens, Muskwa-Kechika Management Area.  *Prepared for* the MK Trust Fund, Fort Nelson, B.C. Prepared by Madrone Consultants Ltd., Prince George, B.C.

Shackleton, D.  1999.  Hoofed Mammals of British Columbia.  Royal BC Museum Handbook, UBC Press, Vancouver, B.C.

## APPENDIX 1:  DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS OF ECOSYSTEM UNITS BY SUBZONE

The following section provides indicates the BEC site series included in each habitat type along with a description of the habitat type itself.  Tree species abbreviations are used frequently (Table 1).

**Table 1.  Tree codes applicable to the area of study.**

| Common name | Latin name | Code |
|---|---|---|
| Black spruce | *Picea mariana* | Sb |
| White spruce | *Picea glauca* | Sw |
| Lodgepole pine | *Pinus contorta* var. *latifolia* | Pl |
| Tamarack | *Larix laricina* | Lt |
| Subalpine fir | *Abies lasiocarpa* | Bl |
| Trembling aspen | *Populus tremuloides* | At* |

*not to be confused with the abbreviation for Alpine Tundra (AT).

| Closed forest (CF) | |
|---|---|
| **BEC Subzone & Variant** | **Broad Ecosystem Units** |
| **BWBSdk** | • SM   Sw - Knight'splume – Stepmoss<br>• BL    Sb – Lingonberry - Knight's plume<br>• BF   Sb–Labrador tea–Moss (north aspect) |
| **BWBSmw2** | • AM   SwAt – Step moss<br>• BK   Sb – Lingonberry – Knight's plume moss<br>• BL  Sb–Lingonberry–Coltsfoot (north aspect) |
| **BWBSwk3** | • FH Subalpine fir - Black huckleberry |
| **SWBmk & mks** | • SB   Sw - Willow-Birch |
| **Description** | Closed forests are typically conifer dominated, and are more or less continuous at low elevations in the major valleys.  Such forests can extend up into the SWBmk but become more and more open with increasing elevation.  On warm aspects trembling aspen is common, especially after forest fires or prescribed burns.  The latter situation is very common in the Toad River region.  The main tree species are Sw, Bl, Pl, and At.  In mature conifer forests thick mosses covers are common along with scattered willows and herbs.  Aspen forests, on the other hand, have a richer cover of herbs and grasses including fireweed, delphinium, western meadowrue and cowparsnip (on moist, rich sites). |

| Habitat value(s) | • winter use<br>• arboreal lichens<br>• terrestrial lichens, especially on dry, pine sites (uncommon in study area)<br>• horsetails on moist sites<br>• more predators, less vision (can't see the forest for the trees!) |
|---|---|

| **Moist to Wet Forest** | |
|---|---|
| **BEC Subzone & Variant** | **Broad Ecosystem Units** |
| **BWBSdk** | • SH  Sw - Currant-Horsetail<br>• BT  Sb-Labrador Tea–Sphagnum |
| **BWBSmw2** | • BB  Sb–Feathermoss–Bluebells<br>• BS  Sb–Cloudberry–Sphagnum<br>• BW  Sb–Willow–Glow moss<br>• SD   Sb - Devil's Club<br>• SH   Sw - Currant-Horsetail<br>• TB  Lt-Buckbean<br>• TH   Lt – Horsetail |
| **BWBSwk3** | • LB Pl – Bluejoint |
| **SWBmk & mks** | • SH  Sw-Cinquefoil-Horsetail<br>• SS  Sw-Willow-Stepmoss |
| **Description** | This unit includes site series that occur on lower slopes, seepage areas, and level to gently sloping valley bottom forests including riparian.  These are the most productive sites for conifers, but boast few deciduous trees.  Understory vegetation of shrubs, herbs and mosses is well developed and diverse. Lower slope seepage forests are often rich in horsetails, particularly scouring rush (*Equisetum scirpoides*) which is eaten by the caribou. |
| **Habitat value(s)** | • food (horsetails, lichens)<br>• adjacent to valley bottom wetlands |

| **Open Forest** | |
|---|---|
| **BEC Subzone & Variant** | **Broad Ecosystem Units** |
| **BWBSmw2** | • LL  Pl–Lingonberry–Velvet-leaved blueberry<br>• LC  Pl–Crowberry |
| **BWBSwk3** | • LC  Pl–Crowberry |
| **SWBmk** | • PL  Sw-Birch-Cladina<br>• SH  Sw-Cinquefoil-Horsetail<br>• SK  Sw-Juniper-Wildrye<br>• SS  Sw-Willow-Stepmoss<br>• SW  Sw-Lupine-Stepmoss |

| SWBmks | • SH  Sw-Cinquefoil-Horsetail<br>• SK  Sw-Juniper-Wildrye<br>• SS  Sw-Willow-Stepmoss |
|---|---|
| Description | The open forests are typically found at higher elevations as a transition between continuous forest and alpine.  These are areas rich in grasses, herbs, lichens and shrubs, due to the open nature of the stands.  On warm aspects species such as trembling aspen and juniper are found.   These areas are often referred to as parkland.  The trees become more and more grouped into "tree islands" with increasing elevation.  Arctic lupines, sagewort, Altai fescue, alpine milk-vetch, violas, and diverse-leaved cinquefoil are common plants. |
| Habitat value(s) | • Abundant forage<br>• Good vision for predators<br>• Close to tundra and higher elevations<br>• Abundant terrestrial lichens<br>• Ease of travel |

| North Aspect Open forest (OFn) | |
|---|---|
| **BEC Subzone & Variant** | **Broad Ecosystem Units** |
| SWBmk | • SP  Sw–Polargrass<br>• SC  "open stunted subalpine woodland"<br>• SL  Sw-Willow-Crowberry<br>• SL  Sw-Willow-Crowberry |
| SWBmks | • SL  Sw-Willow-Crowberry |
| Description | These are cold, nutrient poor sites with pockets of permafrost.  However, due to the open nature of the stands, terrestrial lichens (*Cladina* spp.) are often abundant.  Herbs and grasses are sparse, but willows and scrub birch is common.  Snow can remain on these north aspects well into the growing season. The dominant trees are white and black spruce, however they are often stunted and slow growing due to the cold soil. |
| Habitat value(s) | • Abundant lichens<br>• Presence of scrub birch and willows<br>• Well developed crust on late season snow – easier travel<br>• Cool in summer<br>• Good vision |

| Wetlands (WL) | |
|---|---|
| **BEC Subzone & Variant** | **Broad Ecosystem Units** |
| BWBSmw2 | • SS  Scrub birch–Willow–Water sedge fen |
| All subzones | • FE  Fen<br>• LA  Lake |

| | • RI River |
|---|---|
| **Description** | The most common wetlands in the study area are nutrient rich, sedge-dominated fens. Wetlands also include swamps, and shrub-dominated fens. Rivers and lakes are included as wetlands due to high amount of forage found along their shores. Forage is of high quality. Plants include sedges, buckbean, cattail, and bulrush. In winters of light snow the tops of these plants will be available to browsing animals. |
| **Habitat value(s)** | • Not used by caribou as often as moose<br>• Easy areas for travel in winter |

| **Grasslands (GR)** | |
|---|---|
| **BEC Subzone & Variant** | **Broad Ecosystem Units** |
| **BWBSmw2** | • JB Tall Jacob's ladder–Bluejoint<br>• ME Wet meadow |
| **BWBSwk3** | • JB Tall Jacob's ladder–Bluejoint |
| **SWBmk** | • JB Tall jacob's ladder-Bluejoint<br>• MA Mountain avens-Arctic lupine |
| **Description** | Grasslands typically occur at higher elevations on dry, warm aspects. Soils are often thin, but nutrient-rich. Dominant grasses include Altai fescue, polargrass, western fescue, Rocky Mountain fescue, and alpine bluegrass. Herbs and willows are also common. Drier sites will have kinnickinnick and dwarf blueberry. Well-developed grasslands can occur at surprisingly high elevations given the right combination of slope and aspect. |
| **Habitat value(s)** | • Warmer temperatures in winter<br>• Forage all year round in windy areas<br>• High quality forage |

| **Shrublands and scrublands (SH)** | |
|---|---|
| **BEC Subzone & Variant** | Broad Ecosystem Units |
| **BWBSdk** | • WV Willow – Sitka valerian |
| **BWBSmw** | • SB Sandbar Willow<br>• WA Willow–Alder<br>• WB Avens–Dwarf Willow |
| **BWBSwk3** | • BA Bog blueberry-Alpine bearberry<br>• WA Willow–Alder |
| **SWBmk** | • AW Avens-Dwarf willow<br>• WA Willow-Mountain arnica<br>• WH Willow-Common horsetail<br>• WS Willow - Sedge<br>• WV Willow-Sitka valerian<br>• WY Willow - Yellow mountain avens |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • WM  Willow-Mountain sagewort |
| **SWBmks** | • BS  Birch-fescue |
| | • SA  Scrub birch - Altai fescue |
| | • SC  Bl - krummholz |
| | • WA  Willow-Mountain arnica |
| | • WV  Willow-Sitka valerian |
| | • WM  Willow-Mountain sagewort |
| **Description** | Shrublands typically occur in subalpine areas and upper slopes.  Mosaics of open forest, shrubland, and grassland are common.  The main shrub species are willows, scrub birch, and krummholz conifers (Bl and Sw).  Stunted aspen occasionally occurs on warm, steep, coarse soils. |
| **Habitat value(s)** | • High quality forage |
| | • Close to grasslands and lichen rich areas |

| **Tundra** | |
|---|---|
| **BEC Subzone & Variant** | **Broad Ecosystem Units** |
| **SWBmks** | • AW  Entire-leaved mountain avens-Netted willow |
| | • MA   Mountain avens-Arctic lupine |
| **AT** | • AW   Avens-Dwarf willow |
| | • MA   Mountain avens-Arctic lupine |
| | • ME  Wet meadow |
| | • ML      Moss campion-Limestone sunshine lichen |
| | • WV   Willow-Sitka valerian |
| **Description** | Tundra, by definition, occurs primarily in the Alpine – Tundra zone, although elements of it are found in the SBSmks.  Likewise elements of lower elevation grass and shrublands are found in the tundra.  Tundra is defined both by physiognomy (life-form) and species composition.  The majority of herbs and shrubs are dwarf, and have adaptations to the harsh climate found at higher elevations.  The diversity is nevertheless rich, and forage quality can be high, depending on soil characteristics, slope, aspect, and moisture.  Ground lichens are numerous and alpine species such as few-finger lichen, rock worm lichen, tumble lichen, curled cetraria are common.  Grasses include Altai fescue and alpine sweetgrass, and alpine bluegrass.  Shrubs are typically dwarf willows, stunted scrub birch, and dwarf blueberries.  Scattered krummholz may be present. |
| **Habitat value(s)** | • Insect protection due to wind |
| | • Winter forage in snow free areas |
| | • Escape terrain is often close |
| | • Close to calving areas |
| | • High quality forage in summer months |
| | • Cool summer temperatures |

| Sparsely Vegetated | |
|---|---|
| **BEC Subzone & Variant** | **Broad Ecosystem Units** |
| **BWBSwk3** | • FL Fragrant wood-fern – Lichen |
| **All Subzones** | • CL Cliff<br>• RO Rock outcrop |
| **AT** | • GL Glacier |
| **Description** | This unit includes steep rocky peaks, cliffs, talus slopes, and boulder fields. Vegetation is sparse, but pockets of high quality forage exist, especially on the lower alpine slopes. Climate is very harsh and windy, however snow-free ridges are common. |
| **Habitat value(s)** | • Predators are scarce<br>• Calving frequently occurs in narrow alpine valleys<br>• Some forage is available in snow-free areas |